CASE NO. 11-CV-07154-MRP

ARGUMENT 1 In its February 17, 2012 order, this Court dismissed as inadequately pled the 2 following claims in this case without prejudice: (1) fraudulent misrepresentation, 3 reckless misrepresentation, and fraudulent inducement claims that concern title 4 transfer allegations; (2) aiding and abetting fraud claims against all Defendants; and 5 (3) negligent misrepresentation claims against all Defendants. See Order re: 6 Motions to Dismiss, dated February 17, 2012, Docket No. 170 ("Dismissal Order"), 7 at 9-12. Plaintiffs' decision not to amend these deficient claims (see Amended 8 9 Complaint ("AC") at 1 n.1) warrants that they now be dismissed with prejudice. See Pratts v. Sujan, 176 F.3d 484, 1999 WL 274662, at *1 (9th Cir. Apr. 23, 1999) 10 (unpublished); London v. Coopers & Lybrand, 644 F.2d 811, 814 (9th Cir. 1981); 11 accord Dietz, v. Beneficial Loan & Thrift Co., 2011 WL 6739504, at *3 (D. Minn. 12 Dec. 22, 2011). 13 Plaintiffs do not dispute this, merely incorporating by reference "all of [the] 14 arguments set forth in [their] opposition to Defendants' initial motions to dismiss"— 15 arguments that this Court has already considered and rejected in its Dismissal Order. 16 See Opp. at 1; Dismissal Order at 9-10 (title transfer claims), 10-11 (aiding and 17 abetting claims), and 11-12 (negligent misrepresentation claims). Having failed 18 even to attempt to cure the deficiencies this Court identified in its Dismissal Order, 19 Plaintiffs implicitly have conceded that these claims should be dismissed now with 20 prejudice. See In re Century Aluminum Co. Sec. Litig., 2011 WL 830174, at *6, *8 21 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 3, 2011) (dismissing plaintiffs' Section 11 claim with prejudice 22 when "[p]laintiffs were given the opportunity to, but failed to explain in their TAC 23 how they intended to trace their shares to the Secondary Offering" and "spen[t] the 24 vast majority of their Opposition explaining why th[e] Court's Order" requiring 25 26 Plaintiffs also state that they "reserve[] all appellate rights with respect to 27 these claims, including the right to argue that the [Dismissal] Order was decided incorrectly." Opp. at 1-2. 28

such allegations was wrong rather than "providing the Court with facts explaining 1 2 how they will trace their purchases"); O. Thronas, Inc. v. Blake, 2010 WL 3185118, at *6, *9 (D. Haw. Aug. 10, 2010) (dismissing plaintiffs' RICO claim with prejudice 3 when "[p]laintiffs [] failed to cure the deficiencies in their complaint" and "raise[d] 4 essentially the same arguments in their opposition to Defendants' newest motion to 5 dismiss"). 6 **CONCLUSION** 7 For all the reasons set forth above, the Countrywide Defendants respectfully 8 request that the Court dismiss with prejudice Plaintiffs' fraudulent 9 misrepresentation, reckless misrepresentation, and fraudulent inducement claims 10 based on title transfer allegations, as well as Plaintiffs' negligent misrepresentation 11 and aiding and abetting claims. 12 13 Dated: May 4, 2012 GOODWIN PROCTER LLP 14 /s/ Brian E. Pastuszenski Brian E. Pastuszenski (pro hac vice) 15 Inez H. Friedman-Boyce (pro hac vice) Brian C. Devine (State Bar No. 222240) 16 Caroline H. Bullerjahn (pro hac vice) 17 Counsel for the Countrywide Defendants 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

PROOF OF SERVICE 1 2 I, Mayrav Herman, declare: 3 I am employed in San Francisco County California. I am over the age of 18 4 and not a party to the within action. My business address is Three Embarcadero 5 Center, San Francisco, CA 94111. 6 On May 4, 2012, I served the following document on the persons listed on the 7 service list as follows: 8 COUNTRYWIDE DEFENDANTS' REPLY MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT 9 OF THEIR MOTION TO DISMISS PLAINTIFFS' AMENDED COMPLAINT 10 11 (MAIL) I placed the envelope for collection and mailing, following our 12 ordinary business practices. I am readily familiar with this firm's practice for collecting and processing correspondence for mailing. On the same day that correspondence is placed for collection and mailing, it is deposited in the ordinary course of business with the United States Postal Service, in a 13 sealed envelope with postage fully prepaid. I am a resident or employed in the county where the mailing occurred. The envelope or package was 14 placed in the mail at San Francisco, California. 15 (OVERNIGHT DELIVERY) I deposited in a box or other facility regularly 16 maintained by Federal Express, an express service carrier, or delivered to a courier or driver authorized by said express service carrier to receive 17 documents, a true copy of the foregoing document in sealed envelopes or packages designated by the express service carrier, addressed as stated 18 above, with fees for overnight delivery paid or provided for. 19 (MESSENGER SERVICE) I served the documents by placing them in an envelope or package addressed to the persons at the addresses listed and 20 provided them to a professional messenger service for service. A separate Personal Proof of Service provided by the professional messenger service 21 will be filed under separate cover. 22 (FACSIMILE) Based on an agreement of the parties to accept service by fax transmission, I faxed the documents to the persons at the fax numbers 23 listed. No error was reported by the fax machine that I used. A copy of the 24 record of the fax transmission, which I printed out, is attached. 25 (E-MAIL or ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION) Based on a court order or an agreement of the parties to accept service by e-mail or electronic transmission, I caused the documents to be sent to the persons at the e-mail 26 addresses listed. I did not receive, within a reasonable time after the transmission, any electronic message or other indication that the 27 transmission was unsuccessful. 28

CASE NO. 11-CV-07154-MRP

CASE NO. 11-CV-07154-MRP